

## REMARKS

Reconsideration is respectfully requested.

The Examiner's rejections will be considered in the order of their occurrence in the Office Action.

### Paragraphs 1-2 of the Office Action

Claims 1 through 6 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112 (second paragraph) as being indefinite.

The above amendments to the claims are believed to clarify the requirements of the rejected claims, especially the particular points identified in the Office Action. Specifically, the phrase, "including airplanes" has been deleted from claims 1 and 6, and added claims 7 through 11 are directed to airplanes.

Withdrawal of the §112 rejection of claims 1 through 6 is therefore respectfully requested.

### Paragraphs 4--8 of the Office Action:

Claims 1 through 3 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Thomas.

Claim 2 has been rejected under 35 U.S.C. Section 103(a) as being unpatentable over Thomas.

Claims 3 through 6 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. Section 103(a) as being unpatentable over Thomas in view of Brunsicke.

Claim 1 (and claim 6), particularly as amended, requires "A vehicle fire extinguisher system comprising, in combination" and "a vehicle" and "a pump connected to said valve member and to said conduits for moving said fire extinguishing material from said container through said openings in said conduits, and also includes a mixing member movably disposed in said container and being connected to said pump for mixing said fire extinguishing material contained in said container." (emphasis added). Applicant's claims

teach the combination of a vehicle safety extinguisher system in combination with a vehicle. Further, applicant requires the mixing member be movably disposed within the container for mixing the fire extinguishing material within the container. This feature permits a user to have the mixing member located at different positions within the container and could also be removed to deter or prevent the mixing of gases in a mis-firing situation. This feature provides the benefit of a system being able to adapt to different types of chemical extinguishers and reduce the amount of waste in a testing or misfiring situation.

The Thomas reference teaches a fire extinguishing system for vehicles, but does not require a mixing member movably disposed within a container. *See* col. 3, lines 12 -27. Further, Thomas does not require the combination of a fire extinguishing system and a vehicle. Thus, it is submitted that Applicant's requirements overcome this prior art rejection.

The Brünsicke reference teaches a fire suppression system that includes a mixing chamber that uses apertures to draw a mixture into a chamber containing another mixture for combining the two mixtures. *See* col. 10, lines 23—31. However, the references does not teach that the members are movably disposed within the container; in fact, the mixtures must travel through tubes to the separate mixing chamber before it is distributed to the sensors. *See* col. 9, lines 58 through col. 10, line 5. Further, the reference shows the conical members being horizontally disposed within the chamber and does not show any mobility of the members. *See* Figures 10 through 12.

It is thus submitted that applicant's claims overcome the prior art references, alone and in combination with each other, and that claims 1 through 6 are in condition for allowance.

Withdrawal of the §102(b) rejection of claims 1 through 3 and the §103(a) rejection of claims 2 through 6 is therefore respectfully

requested.

**Added claims:**

Added claims 7 through 11 incorporate the limitations of claims 1 through 5, but specifically require the combination of an airplane. It is submitted that these claims overcome any prior art references and are thus in condition for allowance.